

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-16 were pending, of which claims 14-16 were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 17-20 are added in this Reply. Therefore, claims 1-13 and 17-20 are pending. Claims 1 and 20 are independent.

**OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION**

The Examiner objects to the title of the specification due to an informality. The title is amended to address this issue. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the title be withdrawn.

**§ 103 REJECTION – MOROFUJI, OHKAWARA**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable Morofuji et al. (U.S. Patent 6,208,377) in view of Ohkawara (U.S. Patent 6,630,950). *See Office Action, pages 9-11.* Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claim 1 recites, in part “a correcting device that corrects the integrated value calculated by the integrating device to substantially zero when the differentiated value calculated by the differentiating device is substantially zero.” That is, in the claimed invention, the correction of the integrated value

occurs when the differentiated value is substantially zero. In other words, the differentiated value is associated with the integrated value and the control is performed using the association.

The Examiner readily admits that Morofuji lacks such a feature. *See Office Action, page 10, lines 4-8.* Contrary to the Examiner's allegation, Ohkawara cannot be relied upon to correct for at least this deficiency of Morofuji.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies upon column 28, lines 5-15 and 35-50 of Ohkawara to allegedly teach this feature. The recited portion of Ohkawara refers to Figure 26. Ohkawara indicates that the outputs of the angular velocity sensors 309 and 310 are differentiated in step S1001 to determine the angular acceleration. *See also Figure 25; column 28, lines 25-27.* If the absolute value of the angular acceleration is greater than or equal to some predetermined value  $k$ , a limiting control is disabled by setting the disable flag to 1. *See Figure 26, step S302c; column 28, lines 45-49.* But regardless of whether the disable flag is set or not, the vibration control occurs. *See Figure 26, steps S303-S307; column 28, lines 49-50.* In other words, the differentiated value has no role what so ever in controlling when the correction of the integrated value occurs. Indeed, Ohkawara, the differentiated value and the integrated value are not related at all.

Since neither Morofuji nor Ohkawara teaches or suggests the above recited feature, the combination also cannot teach or suggest the same feature. For this reason alone, independent claim 1 is distinguishable over the combination of Morofuji and Ohkawara.

It is also noted that the Examiner merely alleges that Morofuji and Ohkawara are combinable without providing any motivation what so ever. Without such motivation, the combination of Morofuji and Ohkawara is improper, and any rejection based on the combination is also improper.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 based on Morofuji and Ohkawara be withdrawn.

§ 102 REJECTION – MIYAMOTO

Claims 2-5 and 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Miyamoto et al. (U.S. Patent 6,332,060). See *Office Action, pages 5-8*. Applicant respectfully traverses.

As amended, these claims depend from independent claim 1 directly or indirectly. It is clear that Miyamoto cannot teach or suggest all the features of the independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is distinguishable over Miyamoto.

Due to at least the dependency thereon, claims 2-5 and 10-13 are also distinguishable over Miyamoto. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2-5 and 10-13 based on Miyamoto be withdrawn.

§ 102 REJECTION – IMAFUJI

Claims 6-7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Imafuji et al. (U.S. Patent 5,617,177). *See Office Action, pages 8-9.* Applicant respectfully traverses.

These claims depend from independent claim 1. It is clear that Imafuji cannot teach or suggest all features of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is distinguishable over Imafuji.

For at least due to the dependency thereon, claims 6-7 and 9 are also distinguishable over Imafuji. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 6-7 and 9 based on Imafuji be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – IMAFUJI, MIYAMOTO

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being Imafuji in view of Miyamoto. *See Office Action, page 11.* Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 8 depends from independent claim 1 and it is clear that Imafuji and Miyamoto, individually or in combination, cannot teach or suggest all features of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is distinguishable over the combination of Imafuji and Miyamoto.

And for at least due to the dependency thereon, claim 8 is also distinguishable over the combination of Imafuji and Miyamoto. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 8 based on Imafuji and Miyamoto be withdrawn.

#### NEW CLAIMS

Claims 17-20 are added through this Reply. Applicant respectfully submits that the new claims are all distinguishable over the cited references, individually or in any combination. Applicant respectfully requests that the new claims be allowed.

#### **CONCLUSION**

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Hyung Sohn (Reg. No. 44,346), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit

Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 8, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: 

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No. 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

MKM/HNS:sld